

Mixed charge-spin response functions of an arbitrarily polarized electron gas

Sudhakar Yarlagadda

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhannagar, Calcutta

(February 1, 2008)

In this paper, using different approaches we demonstrate the equality of the two mixed charge-spin response functions of a spin-polarized electron gas when orbital effects are negligible. Within a generalized STLS approximation we show that the two mixed responses are equal. We also present arguments for the equality of the two dynamic responses by considering a symmetry of the effective screened interaction between two opposite spin electrons. Furthermore, using the reflection symmetry of the system and the fact that the hamiltonian is real we prove rigorously that the two responses coincide identically.

71.45.Gm, 71.10.+x, 72.10.Bg, 73.50.Bk

I. INTRODUCTION

An electron gas (EG) can be macroscopically characterized in terms of its response functions. For an unpolarized EG in a uniform positive background, using many-body local fields to account for the vertex corrections associated with the charge and spin density fluctuations, it has been shown in Refs. 1–3 that only the charge response and the longitudinal spin response functions are sufficient to obtain the self-energy and the effective interaction between electrons. Again using the many-body local field formalism, for a system that is polarized it was however found that one has to also have knowledge of the two mixed charge-spin response functions (i.e., the charge response to an external magnetic field and the spin response to an external electric potential) and the transverse spin response⁴. Earlier on Kim et al.⁵ treated the two charge-spin mixed response functions within a random phase approximation and found them to be identical. More recently, Yi and Quinn⁶ studied these two responses in an uniform EG which is polarized by a DC magnetic field but which has negligible orbital effects. These authors conjectured that the two mixed response functions, in general, can be different.

In this paper we demonstrate the equality of the two mixed response functions in the polarized system considered in Ref. 6. In Sec. II, we use arguments of increasing sophistication/rigor to establish the coincidence of the two responses. We first present arguments for the equality of the responses within a generalized STLS approximation⁷. Next we show that the mixed charge-spin responses are equal by exploiting a symmetry of the effective screened interaction between two opposite spin electrons. Lastly by invoking the reflection symmetry of the system and the fact that the hamiltonian is not only hermitian but also real, we prove that the two responses are exactly identical. Finally in Sec. III we discuss the behavior of the mixed responses in the limit of large momentum or large frequency and also present our conclusions.

II. SYMMETRY BASED EQUALITY OF RESPONSES

In the analysis that follows we will ignore the effect of the induced magnetization. We will first derive expressions for the charge, the spin, and the two mixed response functions. Using arguments similar to those used in Ref. 4 we note that the potential felt by an electron of spin σ when an external potential is applied is given by

$$\Phi^\sigma(\vec{q}, \omega) = \Delta n^\sigma / \chi_0^\sigma = \phi^\sigma + v(q) [\Delta n^{-\sigma} (1 - 2G^{\sigma, -\sigma}) + \Delta n^\sigma (1 - 2G^{\sigma, \sigma})], \quad (1)$$

where $v(q)$ is the Coulombic interaction between two electrons. Furthermore χ_0^σ is the non-interacting polarizability, Δn^σ is the density fluctuation, and $G^{\sigma, \sigma'}$ are the many-body local fields and are all functions of $\vec{q}$ and ω . In Eq. (1) for an applied spin symmetric [spin antisymmetric] electric potential $V_{ext}(\vec{q}, \omega)$ [magnetic field $H_{ext}(\vec{q}, \omega)$], $\phi^\sigma(\vec{q}, \omega) = eV_{ext}$ [$g\sigma\mu_B H_{ext}$]. On defining $G_\pm^\sigma \equiv G^{\sigma, \sigma} \pm G^{\sigma, -\sigma}$ we obtain, in agreement with Ref. 6 the following expressions for the charge, the longitudinal spin, and the two mixed charge-spin response functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_C(\vec{q}, \omega) &= \frac{\Delta n^\uparrow + \Delta n^\downarrow}{eV_{ext}} \\ &= \frac{(\chi_0^\uparrow + \chi_0^\downarrow) + 2v(q)\chi_0^\uparrow\chi_0^\downarrow(G_-^\downarrow + G_-^\uparrow)}{\mathcal{D}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\chi_S(\vec{q}, \omega)}{-\mu_B^2} &= \frac{\Delta n^\uparrow - \Delta n^\downarrow}{\mu_B H_{ext}} \\ &= \frac{(\chi_0^\uparrow + \chi_0^\downarrow) + 2v(q)\chi_0^\uparrow\chi_0^\downarrow(G_+^\downarrow + G_+^\uparrow - 2)}{\mathcal{D}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, \omega) &= \frac{\Delta n^\uparrow - \Delta n^\downarrow}{eV_{ext}} \\ &= \frac{(\chi_0^\uparrow - \chi_0^\downarrow) + 2v(q)\chi_0^\uparrow\chi_0^\downarrow(G_+^\downarrow - G_+^\uparrow)}{\mathcal{D}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, \omega) &= \frac{\Delta n^\uparrow + \Delta n^\downarrow}{\mu_B H_{ext}} \\ &= \frac{(\chi_0^\uparrow - \chi_0^\downarrow) + 2v(q)\chi_0^\uparrow\chi_0^\downarrow(G_-^\downarrow - G_-^\uparrow)}{\mathcal{D}},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D} &= 1 - v(q)\chi_0^\uparrow[1 - G_+^\uparrow - G_-^\uparrow] - v(q)\chi_0^\downarrow[1 - G_+^\downarrow - G_-^\downarrow] \\ &\quad - 2v(q)^2\chi_0^\uparrow\chi_0^\downarrow[G_-^\uparrow(1 - G_+^\downarrow) + G_-^\downarrow(1 - G_+^\uparrow)].\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

Thus from Eqs. (4) and (5) we see that the mixed response functions are equal to each other if and only if $G^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(q, \omega) = G^{\downarrow,\uparrow}(q, \omega)$.

We will now argue, within the generalized STLS approximation formulated by Ng and Singwi⁷, that the two mixed response functions are equal. Within the generalized STLS scheme the density fluctuations $\Delta n^\sigma(\vec{q}, \omega)$ induced in the EG by an external spin dependent potential $\phi^\sigma(\vec{q}, \omega)$ are given by (see Ref. 7)

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta n^\sigma/\chi_0^\sigma(\vec{q}, \omega) &= \phi^\sigma + v(q)[\Delta n^{-\sigma}\{1 - 2\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,-\sigma}(q)\} \\ &\quad + \{\Delta n^\sigma(1 - 2\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,\sigma}(q))\}],\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,\sigma'}(q)$ are the *static* many-body local fields. Here we would like to reiterate the known fact that the static nature of the local fields $\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,\sigma'}(q)$ in the STLS scheme is a consequence of the approximation made in obtaining the time-dependent two-particle distribution function and is not a matter of definition as might appear from Eq. (7). From the above considerations [using Eqs. (1) and (7)] we see that the mixed responses within the generalized STLS approach are obtained by replacing $G^{\sigma,\sigma'}(q, \omega)$ with $\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,\sigma'}(q)$ in the expressions for the mixed responses given by Eqs. (4) and (5). It has been shown, by Ng and Singwi that $V_{\text{eff}}^{\sigma\sigma'}(q) \equiv v(q)[1 - 2\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,\sigma'}(q)]$ is related to the pair correlation function in real space as follows

$$V_{\text{eff}}^{\sigma\sigma'}(r) = - \int_r^\infty \frac{dv(R)}{dR} g_{\sigma\sigma'}(R) dR. \quad (8)$$

We will now demonstrate that $g_{\sigma-\sigma}(\vec{r}) = g_{-\sigma\sigma}(\vec{r})$. Firstly we observe, for an arbitrarily spin polarized EG in any dimension, that due to reflection symmetry the static pair correlation function $g_{\sigma\sigma'}(\vec{r})$ satisfies the relationship $g_{\sigma\sigma'}(\vec{r}) = g_{\sigma\sigma'}(-\vec{r})$. Next we note that the pair correlation function $g_{\sigma-\sigma}(\vec{r})$ is related to the instantaneous density-density correlation function through the relation

$$g_{\sigma-\sigma}(\vec{r}) = \frac{\langle 0|\rho^\sigma(\vec{r} + \vec{r}')\rho^{-\sigma}(\vec{r}')|0 \rangle}{N^\sigma N^{-\sigma}}, \quad (9)$$

where N^σ is the number of spin σ particles in a system of unit volume and $\rho^\sigma(\vec{r})$ is the density operator in real space. Then, since the system has reflection symmetry and translational invariance, it follows that $g_{\sigma-\sigma}(\vec{r}) = g_{-\sigma\sigma}(\vec{r})$ ⁸. Then from Eq. (8) it is clear that

$\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,-\sigma}(q) = \mathcal{G}^{-\sigma,\sigma}(q)$ and thus we see that the two mixed responses are equal within the generalized STLS scheme. Here it should be pointed out that the many-body local fields $\mathcal{G}^{\sigma,\sigma'}(q)$ in the generalized STLS approximation are not functions of frequency and thus are not the same as the true static many-body local fields $G^{\sigma,\sigma'}(q, 0)$.

We will now proceed to give arguments for the equality of the two dynamic many-body local fields $G^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(q, \omega)$ and $G^{\downarrow,\uparrow}(q, \omega)$. To this end we will derive the effective screened potential $W_{-\sigma\sigma}$ felt by a spin $-\sigma$ electron in the EG when a spin σ electron sets up perturbations and then show that based on a symmetry of $W_{-\sigma\sigma}$ one obtains $G^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(q, \omega) = G^{\downarrow,\uparrow}(q, \omega)$. Let ρ_e^σ be the number density of the perturbing electron setting up density fluctuations Δn^σ and $\Delta n^{-\sigma}$. Then the potential felt by an electron of spin σ' is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{\sigma'\sigma}^* &= \Delta n^{\sigma'}/\chi_0^{\sigma'} = \phi_{\sigma'\sigma} + v(q)[\Delta n^{-\sigma}(1 - 2G^{\sigma',-\sigma}) \\ &\quad + \Delta n^\sigma(1 - 2G^{\sigma',\sigma})],\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi_{\sigma'\sigma} = v(q)\rho_e^\sigma(1 - 2G^{\sigma',\sigma}). \quad (10)$$

On simplifying the above one gets

$$\Phi_{-\sigma\sigma}^* = \frac{\phi_{-\sigma\sigma}}{\mathcal{D}}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is given by Eq. (6). Now, as argued in Refs. 1 and 9 for an unpolarized system, the actual screened potential between the two electrons $W_{\sigma'\sigma}$ is given by

$$W_{\sigma'\sigma}\rho_e^\sigma = \Phi_{\sigma'\sigma}^* + 2v(q)\rho_e^\sigma G^{\sigma',\sigma}. \quad (12)$$

The effective screened potential $W_{\sigma'\sigma}$ obtained in such a fashion also agrees, for an infinitesimally polarized system, with the results of Ref. 4. Furthermore, in our treatment if $\rho_e^{-\sigma}$ is a spectator electron which experiences an effective screened potential $W_{-\sigma\sigma}$, the interaction energy between the two electrons ρ_e^σ and $\rho_e^{-\sigma}$ is $W_{-\sigma\sigma}\rho_e^\sigma\rho_e^{-\sigma}$. From the fact that the interaction energy between the two electrons ρ_e^σ and $\rho_e^{-\sigma}$ is the same irrespective of whether ρ_e^σ is the perturbing electron with $\rho_e^{-\sigma}$ being the spectator electron or vice versa, we have $W_{\uparrow\downarrow} = W_{\downarrow\uparrow}$. It then follows from Eq. (12) that $G^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(q, \omega) = G^{\downarrow,\uparrow}(q, \omega)$ and hence that $\chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, \omega) = \chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, \omega)$.

We also note that the effective screened interaction between two electrons can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}W_{\sigma\sigma} &= v(q)^2 \{ (1 - G_+^\sigma)^2 \chi_C + (G_-^\sigma)^2 \chi_S / (-\mu_B^2) \\ &\quad - \sigma(1 - G_+^\sigma)G_-^\sigma [\chi_{CS}^V + \chi_{CS}^H] \} \\ &\quad + v(q) + 2\sigma v(q)^2 \chi_0^{-\sigma} (1 - G_+^\sigma + G_-^\sigma) \frac{G^{\uparrow\downarrow} - G^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{\mathcal{D}},\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\uparrow\uparrow} = & v(q)^2 \left\{ (1 - G_+^\uparrow)(1 - G_+^\downarrow)\chi_C - G_-^\uparrow G_-^\downarrow\chi_S/(-\mu_B^2) \right. \\
& \left. + (1 - G_+^\uparrow)G_-^\downarrow\chi_{CS}^H - (1 - G_+^\downarrow)G_-^\uparrow\chi_{CS}^V \right\} \\
& + v(q) + 2v(q)^2\chi_0^\downarrow(1 - G_+^\downarrow - G_-^\downarrow)\frac{G^{\uparrow\downarrow} - G^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

When $G^{\uparrow\downarrow} = G^{\downarrow\uparrow}$ we see from the above two equations for $W_{\sigma\sigma}$ and $W_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ that the last term vanishes and the resulting expressions have a pleasing symmetry in terms of the response functions.

We will now prove that the two responses are identical to each other by invoking the reflection symmetry and the real valued property of the hamiltonian. For this purpose, we begin with the definitions of the mixed charge-spin response functions.

$$\chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, t) \equiv -i\theta(t) \langle 0 | [S_{-\vec{q}}^z(t), \rho_{\vec{q}}] | 0 \rangle, \quad (15)$$

and

$$\chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, t) \equiv -i\theta(t) \langle 0 | [\rho_{-\vec{q}}(t), S_{\vec{q}}^z] | 0 \rangle, \quad (16)$$

where χ_{CS}^V (χ_{CS}^H) corresponds to the spin (charge) response when an external electric potential (magnetic field) is applied. Furthermore $\rho_{\vec{q}}$ and $S_{-\vec{q}}^z$ represent respectively the charge and spin density fluctuation operators in momentum space, while $\theta(t)$ stands for the step function. From the above definitions one obtains (see Ref. 4 for alternate derivations)

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, \nu) = & \sum_n \left\{ \frac{\langle 0 | \rho_{-\vec{q}} | n \rangle \langle n | S_{\vec{q}}^z | 0 \rangle}{\nu - \omega_{n0} + i\eta} \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{\langle 0 | S_{\vec{q}}^z | n \rangle \langle n | \rho_{-\vec{q}} | 0 \rangle}{\nu + \omega_{n0} + i\eta} \right\}, \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, \nu) = & \sum_n \left\{ \frac{\langle 0 | S_{-\vec{q}}^z | n \rangle \langle n | \rho_{\vec{q}} | 0 \rangle}{\nu - \omega_{n0} + i\eta} \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{\langle 0 | \rho_{\vec{q}} | n \rangle \langle n | S_{-\vec{q}}^z | 0 \rangle}{\nu + \omega_{n0} + i\eta} \right\}. \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, in the hamiltonian we note that the kinetic term ($p_i^2/(2m)$) and the interaction term ($\sum_{i \neq j} v(\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j)$) have inversion symmetry. Furthermore the Zeeman term ($g\mu_B \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{H}_{ext}$) also has reflection symmetry because both spin and magnetic field are pseudo vectors. Then, since reflection symmetry holds for all the terms of the hamiltonian, we have $\chi_{CS}^{V(H)}(\vec{q}, \omega) = \chi_{CS}^{V(H)}(-\vec{q}, \omega)$ and hence we obtain the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, \omega = 0) &= \chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, \omega = 0) \\
&= - \sum_n \frac{1}{\omega_{n0}} \left\{ \langle 0 | S_{\vec{q}}^z | n \rangle \langle n | \rho_{-\vec{q}} | 0 \rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \langle 0 | \rho_{-\vec{q}} | n \rangle \langle n | S_{\vec{q}}^z | 0 \rangle \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that reflection symmetry alone is sufficient to produce equality of the two mixed responses in the static case.

We will now prove that the two mixed responses coincide in the more general dynamic case as well. We first note that the hamiltonian is real when the external uniform magnetic field is taken to be in the z-direction leading to the Zeeman term being real. Then the eigenvectors of the hamiltonian can be taken to be real. Consequently we observe that $\langle n | \rho_{\vec{q}} | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \rho_{\vec{q}} | n \rangle$ and $\langle 0 | S_{\vec{q}}^z | n \rangle = \langle n | S_{\vec{q}}^z | 0 \rangle$. Based on the above equalities and reflection symmetry it follows from Eqs. (17) and (18) that $\chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, \omega) = \chi_{CS}^V(-\vec{q}, \omega) = \chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, \omega)$. Here we would like to point out that reflection symmetry holds even if orbital effects are not negligible. However, when the orbital effects are included, the eigenvectors need not be real and hence the mixed responses need not be equal.

The arguments involving reflection symmetry and the hamiltonian being real can be generalized to give the equality of the response functions $-i\theta(t) \langle 0 | [A_{-\vec{q}}(t), B_{\vec{q}}] | 0 \rangle$ and $-i\theta(t) \langle 0 | [B_{-\vec{q}}(t), A_{\vec{q}}] | 0 \rangle$ where A and B are operators. Here, if in one response function we interchange the time independent operator that couples to the external field with the time-dependent operator that corresponds to the response of the system we get the other response function.

III. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In Ref. 10, Marinescu and Quinn obtained exact expressions for the many-body local fields of a polarized system in the large momentum limit or large frequency limit by using approaches similar to those used for unpolarized systems in Refs. 11 and 12. In the large momentum limit, $G^{\uparrow,\downarrow}$ and $G^{\downarrow,\uparrow}$ have the same functional dependence on the pair correlation functions $g^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(0)$ and $g^{\downarrow,\uparrow}(0)$ respectively and hence it follows from reflection symmetry that $G^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(q \rightarrow \infty, \omega) = G^{\downarrow,\uparrow}(q \rightarrow \infty, \omega)$. Furthermore for finite q and $\omega \rightarrow \infty$, we note that $\chi_0^\sigma(q, \omega) \sim N^\sigma q^2/(m\omega^2)$ and from Ref. 10 that $G^{\sigma,-\sigma}(q, \omega \rightarrow \infty)$ is even at least up to order $1/\omega^2$. Then, from Eqs. (4)–(6) it follows that the difference between the two responses is of the form

$$\chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, \omega \rightarrow \infty) - \chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, \omega \rightarrow \infty) \sim A/\omega^4 + B/\omega^6 + \dots,$$

and is thus an even function of $1/\omega$ to at least order $1/\omega^6$. Next, from Eqs. (17) and (18), on using only reflection symmetry, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{CS}^V(\vec{q}, \omega \rightarrow \infty) - \chi_{CS}^H(\vec{q}, \omega \rightarrow \infty) &= 2 \sum_n \left\{ \langle 0 | S_{\vec{q}}^z | n \rangle \langle n | \rho_{-\vec{q}} | 0 \rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \langle 0 | \rho_{-\vec{q}} | n \rangle \langle n | S_{\vec{q}}^z | 0 \rangle \right\} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega} + \frac{\omega_{n0}^2}{\omega^3} + \frac{\omega_{n0}^4}{\omega^5} + \dots \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ we see from the above two equations that the two mixed responses, when expanded as a series in powers of $1/\omega$, coincide at least to order $1/\omega^6$.

In conclusion, within a generalized STLS framework we showed that the two charge-spin response functions coincide. Furthermore, we also presented arguments for their equality in the dynamic case by considering a symmetry of the effective screened interaction between two opposite spin electrons. Lastly, from the facts that the system has reflection symmetry and that the hamiltonian is real we established the equality of the two mixed response functions.

Extending the study of mixed responses to quantum Hall effect systems and including orbital effects could lead to some interesting insights.

The author would like to thank Subrata Ray and A. Harindranath for discussions.

-
- ¹ C. A. Kukkonen and A. W. Overhauser, Phys. Rev. B **20**, 550 (1979).
 - ² G. Vignale and K. S. Singwi, Phys. Rev. B **32**, 2156 (1985); K. S. Singwi, Physica Scripta **32**, 397 (1985).
 - ³ S. Yarlagadda and G. F. Giuliani, Solid State Commun. **69**, 677 (1989).
 - ⁴ S. Yarlagadda and G. F. Giuliani, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 7887 (1994).
 - ⁵ D. J. Kim, B. B. Schwartz, and H. C. Praddaude, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 205 (1973).
 - ⁶ K. S. Yi and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 13398 (1996).
 - ⁷ T. K. Ng and K. S. Singwi, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 6683 (1987).
 - ⁸ Alternately, by defining the pair distribution function in terms of the many-body wavefunction, we can also show the equality $g_{\sigma\sigma'}(\vec{r}) = g_{\sigma'\sigma}(\vec{r})$.
 - ⁹ S. Yarlagadda and G. F. Giuliani (unpublished).
 - ¹⁰ D. C. Marinescu and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 1114 (1997).
 - ¹¹ G. Niklasson, Phys. Rev. B **10**, 3052 (1974).
 - ¹² X. Zhu and A. W. Overhauser, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 3158 (1984).